Previous references.

Pol File No. 1-06

1906-07

(Police)

Serial Nos. 228, 242
256-8, 264, 281, 285-6
301-3, 314, 320, 331, 370,
387, 393, 394, 423, 448
470-2

Later references.

Police (Sof) 85 82, 97, 252 re
B. July 08

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. ~~228~~, 242, 256-8, 264, 281, 285-6, 286 4.
301-3, 314, 320, 331, 370, 379, 387, 393
423, 448, 470-2

Part B. for September 1907.

SUBJECT.

Petitions
Rama Procession at Channapatna

	Table of Contents
228	Mom. Peer Sab and other Mahomedans of Channapatna. Forward their petition re the Rama procession with two rupees stamp duly affixed
G. R. S. 58 242	To the District magistrate Bangalore No 2264 of 17.1.08 Forwarded the above for Report

256 From the District magistrate, Bangalore No 597
Dt 12.2.07
Submits a report as called for in the above

257 From Peer Sab. Channapatna. Dt 4.2.07
A reminder to his former petition

258 From Pasare Venkatramiah, Channapatna
Dt 7.2.1907
Prays for the grant of a copy of SC 228

264 To Mr. S.V. Ramaswamiengar Advocate No 2473
Dt 18.2.1907
Informs him that a copy of SC will be granted on payment of a copying fee of Rs. 10.

281 From Peer Sabee. Dt 1.3.1907
Requests that the Distt. magistrate may be instructed to hold the order passed by him in the matter of the conduct of the Rama procession, in abeyance pending disposal of the appeal.

285 To the Distt. Magte. Bangalore Y2670 Dt 2.3.07
Forwards the above for report.

286. From the Mahomedans of Channapatna.
Telegram Dt 2.3.1907.
Complain that Rama procession was carried through Mahomedan streets Contrary to mamuli with the view of the Special Reserve Police

286A Same as above.

301 From the Distt magte No 5683 Dt 7.3.1907
Submits his report as called for in Sl 281

G. R. S. 11] 1906.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Police)

NOTES.

File No. 1 of 06

File Heading.

Petitions

From

Peer Sait and other Mahomedans of Channapatna

No. Dated Received 10.1.07

Diary No. J1694 Enclos. 14 Spare Copies. Serial No. 228

Brief Abstract of Letter.

Forward their petition re the Kana processes with two rupees stamp affixed to it.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Subo. for orders with a draft forwarding the petition to the Dt Magte. of Bangalore for report

By. 12-1-07 SN 12/1/07. 2 Mnes 12/1/10

Notes—First sheet.

MGCPB—30,000—17-2-05.

2

G.R.S. 12J
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. 1 of 190 6-07

Serial No.	
242	To The Dt. Magte. Bangalore no. J 2049 D/ 17.1.07 Calls for a report on the petition
256	from The Dt. Magte. Bangalore no. 1597 D/ 1.2.07 Forwards the report called for in the above.
257	from Peer Sab, Channapatna. Petition D/ 4.2.07 A reminder to his former petition
258	from Pasare Venu Gramanidi of Channapatna Petition D/ 7.2.07 Prays for a copy of the petition of Peer Sab & other Mahomedans

3 The present dispute is one between the Hindus and Mahomedans of Channapatna Rama idols are set up at Channapatna in 3 places, namely, pette, fort, and Yalakere. The contention of the Hindus is that, in accordance with the agreement come to by the representatives of the two communities in question in 1889, they should be permitted

File B

MGCPB—50,000— 24-7-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. of 190 6-07

Serial No.

to take the 3 Kamas together in procession through the pettah. The Mahomedans, however contend that the Hindus should not be allowed to take the 3 Kamas together through the pettah but that the processions of the several Kamas should be confined to the locality in which they are set up. They further state that the agreement of 1889 is void as their community was not fairly represented when it was drawn up. The Hindus, at the first instance, petitioned the Assistant Magistrate of Chamrajpet for licence to conduct the Kama procession in accordance with the terms of the agreement. This petition was rejected and the Hindus petitioned the Sub-Divisional Magistrate of Closepet and the Dt. Magte of Bangalore in the matter. These two petitions were in the usual course of business,

Note—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—23 10-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. of 190 6-07

Serial No.

sent to the Amildar Magistrate for disposal. But at the request of one of the parties the case was remitted to the Sub-Divisional Magistrate who, however, rejected the petition of the Hindus on the ground that the agreement relied on by the Hindus was never acted upon and that the petitioners had failed to prove the existence of any manool in their favour. On appeal this order was set aside by the Dt. Magte of Bangalore on the following grounds:-

(1) That lapse of time does in no way debar the Hindus from carrying on the procession according to the terms of the agreement come to by both parties.

(2) That the objection of the Mahomedans as regards improper representation at the time of drawing up the agreement was come too late - after as

GPB—50,000—23 10-05

G.R.S. 12j
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. / of 190 6-07

Seria No.

Lapse of 17 years. He is of opinion that there need be no apprehension about breach of peace as that matter may safely be left to the local Police and Magistracy. Therefore he has permitted the Hindus to conduct their procession in accordance with the agreement. The present petition of Peer Sab and others is an appeal against this order. The Dt. Magte states that he has directed his order to be kept in abeyance pending the decision of Govt. It appears from the copy of the agreement subd. with the record that the Committee to which the question was referred in 1889 consists of nearly an equal number of representatives of both sects Subd. for orders. Orders

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12J
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. of 1906-07

Serial No.

are also solicited as to whether the copy applied for by Venkataramaniah may be granted.

3.2.07

Subd to 2nd Councillor for orders

13/2/07

4 Subd The file was returned for granting a copy of the petition applied for. Subo. with a draft endorsement after issuing which (if approved) the file will be resubd. to 2nd Councillor.

Subd pared

15/2/07

6 In the meanwhile the file was taken by the Councillor Clerk for his orders.

5.2.07.

64 Endorsement issued to Rev. S.N. Ramaswamiayar Advocate. no I 2673

18.2.07

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

Serial No 7

The Asstt Commr meekes decision appears to be correct).

The Petn of appeal may be referred to the Dy Commr & Distt Magte of Bangalore for further enquiry & disposal by him - with the following remarks

The question at issue regarding Kanna processions in Channapatna should be settled strictly with reference to precedents and well established manual - and not on general & theoretical grounds the attention of the Dy Commr & Distt Magte shd be invited to the observations made in para 1 of GOs

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. of 190 6-07

Serial No.

proceedings No. 5096-103½ dated 5th May 1906 (Murzo... which are applicable to the present case. The agreement of 1888 maybe relevant, but is not conclusive as regards the facts in issue. The appeal should be disposed of in conformity with the principles enunciated in the G.O. above referred to

H.W. Nethersole
2d Jointsecretary
15/2/07.

10 Draft as req. & submit to Dewan before issue - Circulate to Mussalmans as desired by Govt (?)
15-2-07
16/4/07

11 Subo. with a draft order and a draft endorsement.
3.4.07
6.2.07
12 Subo to Dewan for approval
W. 18/2/07

3855
23.2.07

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat. Police File No. of 190 6-07

Serial No. 281 Petition dt 1.3.07 from Peer Sab & other Mahomedans of Channapatna

Request that the Dt. Magistrate of Bangalore may be directed to keep the order passed by him in re' the "Kama procession" in Channapatna in abeyance pending the disposal of their petition to Government.

3 Subdy
The previous papers were subd to the Dewan on the 18th February 1907. In the present appeal, the petitioners pray that the order of the Dt magte permitting the "Kama" procession by Hindus in certain streets may be directed to be suspended till the appeal is disposed of

Note—Contn. sheet

GPB—40,000—12 5-06

Serial No.

14 Subd. Forth a draft Memo forwarding the ~~for~~ appeal for report.

CR 2/3/07. Very) WS 2/3/07

2/3/07

15 Passed WPL 2/3/07 WS 2/3/07

85 To The DC. Inspr, Bangalore. no. J 2670 D/ 2.3.07
forwards the above for very early report.

86 From The Mahomedans of Channapatna
Telegram D/ 2.3.07

Complain that the Hindus with the help of the Special Reserve Police carried their Kamas, contrary to usual, through Mahomedan streets

16 Subd. May the report called for be awaited?

B.P. CR 5.3.07 5/3/07 Very) WS 5/3/07

17 [illegible] 7/3/07

86, From The Mahomedans of Channapatna
Telegram D/ 2.3.07

Same as above.

WS 7/3/07

Serial No.

16

I do not see how we can interfere with the order passed by the Distt Magistrate. Before passing any orders of on questions of the principle that should guide the regulation of processions of this kind a full report from the Dr Commissr as to the circs of the case may be called for. If as appears to be the case the Distt Magistrate bases his order on the agreement come to by the parties in 1899 I do not see that any good will result from ordering further investigation. The agreement was evidently intended to be a final settlement of all subsisting disputes between the parties.

8/11/07

8/11/07 19

Was not the Dr Magistrate's report received recently

9/11/07

9/11/07

I think

GPB—40,000—12 5-06

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. of 1906-07

Serial No.	
301	From The Dt. Magte. no. s 683 D/7.3.07 Reports on sl no. 281
302	Letter D/ 7.3.07 from Mr. H. Lubeck, B.A.B.L. Bar-at-law, Madras Requests that he may be heard on behalf of the Mahomedans before passing final orders on the subject.
303	Petition from Peer Sab on behalf of the Mahommedans D/ 6.3.07 Complains that the processions were conducted against manual and that they were fences in, &c.

20 In his letter no. s 597 D/1.2.07 the Dt. Magte. stated that on the representation of the Mahomedans he had directed his order of the 24th November 1906 to be kept in abeyance pending the disposal of the appeal bef Govt. It is now stated that as no orders has been received from Govt & as the Hindus had been anxious to hold the festival this order was set aside and the Amildar Magte was directed to issue licenses for conducting the Rama processions in strict accordance with the agreement of 1899.

Note—Contn. sheet

GPB—40,000—12-5-06

Serial
No.

Log W

21 From the records it is seen that a meeting of the Mahomedans of the place was convened on 27.2.07 by the Police Inspector & the Amildar and that the assembly unanimously agreed to abide by the Dt. Magte's decision and to cooperate if need be, with the officials in maintaining peace. It is reported both by the Amildar and the Sub-Divisional Magistrate that the procession passed off peacefully. Subd. for orders.
B.G
12-3-07 SW 12/3/07. Mr. Lubeck on behalf of the maho-
-medans requests that he may be heard before final orders are passed in the matter?

SW
12/3/07 Seen VT 12/3/07

22 This is not a Council case, ~~and I do not know that an order can be passed by a Magistrate~~ as implied by Mr Lubeck; but possibly the Second Councillor may withdraw what he has to say before recording his opinion. If so, Mr Lubeck will be heard on a date to be specified.

Serial No.

(a) In my opinion there do not seem to be sufficient grounds either for impugning the validity of the agreement of 1884 or for interfering with the District Magistrate's order allowing the Unions to conduct their Kavadi processions in accordance with that agreement. The place of manual in such cases is strictly limited. Manual, as I view the matter, only comes in where a right not prima facie reasonable or which is opposed to the reasonable rights of others is set up. Where the right is established by agreement (as in this case), or is an inherent one (e.g. the right to use a highway for lawful purposes), manual has not much scope. It seems to me safe to apply in all such cases the principles laid down in clauses (a) to (d) of para 5 of the Order of 27 Febr 1893 No 109-D.Os.

Devan Nair 20/1

21.3.07

H24O -

* I may perhaps refer also to the Draft rules prepared by me on 26.3.07. (Page Y)

25 In the meanwhile another petition was received.

21/3/07

G.P.S.—10.000—18-1-07

G.R.S. 121
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. of 1906-07

15

Serial No. 374

Petition from Peer Sab & other Muhammadans of Chamapatna.

Complain that on or about the 1st March 1907 their principal ways of ingress and egress were barred by bamboo fences and they were prevented from moving about from place to place &c, and that all this was done to enable the Hindus to carry on the Kama procession against manual

26 Subo. The file relating to the case was subo. to Secy. on 13.3.07. May this be subo. in continuation?

I have perused this with interest

3.9.07 SN 18/8/07 Secy) hs 18/8/07

27

This is, I think, a rather frivolous complaint - Case by the Subdivisional Asstt Commr reported by 3rd March (sic) shows that though barricades were put up in some of the important lanes, there was no unnecessary obstruction to people going about their domestic business - 2nd (sic)

hs 24.8.07

hs 27/8/07

P.T.O.

Note—Contn. sheet

GPB—40,000—12 5-06

Serial No. 320

From The Private Secy. to H.H. the Maharaja

no. 2189 dt 6.3.07

Forwards for disposal a telegram from Khadirbasha and other Mahomedans of Channapatna complaining that their ways were obstructed by the Police and the Hindus enabled to carry on Rama processions through Mahomedan streets

28 Subo. The file relating to the subject is pending with the Secy. May this be subo. in continuance

B.S. 21.3.07 SW 21/3/07 Subo Secy

29 21/3/07

The file was since been received from the Secy. Subo. to 2nd Councillor.

B.S. 22.3.07)

30

Petn may be referred to the DC Mangte, thro' the Dy Supt of Police for report

1204/22.3.07

22/3/07.

31 Do — no

Final draft 9.15

22/3/07

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. 190 6-07

Serial No.

32 Subo. with a draft as directed.

3-4. 15-3-07

25/3/07

33 Issues

25/3/07

331 Draft issued no. J 3020 dt 26.3.07

34 Second Councillor's orders on the Secy's note of the 21st March 1907 (page 14.)

35 I shall not hazard an opinion before hearing both

120V 22.3.07

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—10,000—18-1

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—40,000—12-5-06

Serial
No.

parties - I defer to the opinion
of the Dewan recorded on
8/3/07 [illegible]
22/3/07
[illegible]
22/3/07
[illegible]
22/3/07

4222
23/3/07 36

If the 2nd Cr thinks that
it is desirable to hear the parties
before the matter is finally
disposed of, I have certainly
no objection

[illegible]
26/3/07

37

Instructions [illegible] a date which will be convenient for
hearing the parties -

[illegible]
26/3/07

[illegible]
DC(T)

[illegible]
30.3

38

1281
30.3.07 As directed by the Dewan on
8/3/07 a full report as to
the circumstances of the
case may be called for from
the D.C. - On receipt of it,

Serial No.

a day may be fixed in May 1907 for hearing both parties

39 Date accordingly 30/3/07

Put up 30/3/07

40 Subo. with a draft calling for a report from the Dt. Magte. of Bangalore.

B.G. 1.4.07

41 Issued 2/4

370 Draft issued to the Dt. Magte, Bangalore no. J 3076 dt 4.4.07

379 From the Dt. Magte. Bangalore no. S 793 dt 26.4.07

forwards, through the D.G. of Police, a detailed report in the matter with the records

42 The facts of the case up to the carrying out of the procession are given in pages 3-6 & 12-13 of this note. The only additional information contained in the present report is that the allegations made in pl no. 314 against the police & the magists

Serial
No.

are false. Subd. for orders with a draft letter to Mr Lubeck, Bar-at-Law, Madras

B.G. 30.4.07 SN 30/4/07 43

Issue. Also give similar notice to the other party & submit the file to the 2nd Court before the date of hearing

file

hm 1/5/07

387 Draft issued to Mr. Lubeck no. J 3353 D/ 1.5.07

44 Subd. with a draft to Mr. S. N. Ramaswamiengar, Advocate

Vide 7 Leg V

B.G. 2.5.07 SN 2-5-07 Who seems to be the standing Counsel for the Minors in the case

45 Passed. ~~Let~~ To ensure that the case may be heard on the date fixed it would be better ~~to write~~ give instructions to Pasare Venkatramaniah of Chemnapatna

hm 3/5

B.G. 3/5

46 Subd. with another draft to Pasare Venkatramaniah.

B.G. 3.5.07 SN 3/5/07 4

47 Issue hm 4/5

To

393 Mr. S. N. Ramaswamiengar, Advocate no. J 3388 D/ 4.5.07

GPB—10,000—18-1-07

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. of 190 6-07

Serial No.

Informs him that the case will be heard on 20th May 07 at the Public office buildings.
To Pasare Venkatarāmaniah Collr no. J3389.
DJ 4.5.07

Same as above.
4 Subd. to the 2nd Councillor with the Records.
B.G. 7-5-07 SW 7/5/07

4 Messrs Lubeck & Ramaswamiengar were heard by the 2nd Councillor to-day. Notes of their arguments are annexed.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—30,000—25-2-07

50

Mr. Lubeck.

~~Grant Road~~ Separate village

Nolthidu templeis Yeledere.

Kana procession always limited

to limits of Yeledere. upto Railway gate.

+ From ~~1876~~ 1894 the licenses used to refer to

the R^y lane as limit

The change was made in 1907.

Many Hindus wanted to get the land

but ^ Mahomedans did not allow.

Mr Spanks allowed it.

In 1884 the Hindus & Mahomedans signed

an agreement allowing Hindus to

get the land.

The agreement was never given effect

to. The licenses always said,

"upto the Railway gate".

- Vide ~~Sir~~ Sub-div. officer's order.

~~Trustees~~

Evidence before 1st class magte

Muddathamudaiya of Yelandimadu

"~~Hindus~~ we never took the

Kana beyond the R^y gate". Licenses

~~do~~ not contains this restriction.

Sanjeevegowda - Resident of Kat.

~~Subjects~~ they heard no Kana. walk

before -

+ all the licenses from 1884 to 1894

× Mashandal.

23

Licence granted to that people
for the 1st time in 19. Kerala

Licences to Gentoo people
" for the village

Notice of 4-4-71. Drums like Appeal
Mosque Burial grounds-
Hindus musician stopped music near
burial ground; but the Police Officer
asked him to go on

+ not under the Kazi. Agreement - 4 Muslims & the Mohammedan
community cannot be legally bound by a person
not even the It may bind the persons
but not even their descendants.
For 17 years it was asked leave,
Licence has been granted.

I.L.R. 16 Mad. p 575. There is no right in the Mohammedans
processions

Agreement - (1) not legal
(2) Mere applications for licence
constitutes a waiver
(3) The local authorities did not
recognise it.

Suggest an alternative → If the Gentoos people want to join the
Town people, let them go another way

Drums

5-1

Mr. S. N. Ramaswamiengar

1. Not concerned with success of Plea.

2. The agreement was entered into by 4 people. It must have been the old manual — ~~Entered~~ It is apparently not a pronouncement of ~~his~~ new rights, but of old manual — reduced thereto in writing
[~~Undated~~. The agreement does not recite the fact that it is the manual].

3. Good many had to go along particular route — in which streets in which any Hindus reside — (or with ~~stop~~ music in front of Mahomedans) place of worship —

~~Without war~~.

The fact that we did not exercise our right for a certain period does not show that we have lost it.

Next. Magts' order allows us only to pass thro' streets occupied solely by Hindus.

~~We are agreeable to be bound to pay damages~~

There is no limitation of natural rights.

In 91-92 license was given in accordance with agreement.

If in subsequent years

25

Business [illegible] restricted up to railway gate, it may have been because that was all land was applied for

We do not want to go into Mahamadan Nobles -

Business of Imperial Legislative Council

The Viceroy's Council in Mohammedan Nobles case, held proceeding case, stated that there are differences in the law in respect of Hyderabad Bar Nizam as regard processes

Mr Dubash.

Memorandum of 1891 does not follow the agreements

If in 91-92 the agreements followed, the fact that it was set aside in 1894 shows that it has become a dead letter.

If there was no agreement, what would you do? Is this to account?

Mr Mumford -

There is no one sheet solely occupied by Mahamadans. Hindus & Mohammedans

If there is, we have no objection -

Arguments of Lawyers in the Akmimana Kama Procession Case.

Before the Legal Councillor

20/5/07.

5

Mr Lubeck. For the Mahomedans.

The Gandemada or Yaledere village is 2½ miles from the Akmimana town, although it is included in the Akmimana Municipality. There is no Hindu temple in Yaledere.

The Kama procession of the Yaledere village always used to be confined to the limits of that village and was prohibited to go beyond the railway gate, which is at the boundary between Yaledere and Akmimana. This is proved by the licenses issued from 1894, copies of which have been filed. An innovation was made for the first time in March 1907, when the Hindus of Yaledere wanted to take their Kama procession to the tank at Akmimana. The local authorities — the Arnibar and the Sub-Divisional Officer — decided against the Hindus. Mr. Sparks, the Dt. Magistrate, however, decided for them. The decision was based on an agreement executed in 1889.

In 1889 there were riots between Hindus & Mahomedans at Akmimana. After that the people of both the communities were probably advised by the local authorities to come to an agreement so as to prevent future quarrels. Such an agreement was made

but the Mahammadan community was not properly represented. The so-called agreement was signed only by one Mahomedan, Mastanbab. The agreement purports to ~~give~~ allow the Hindus to take the Kama procession upto the tank. This so-called agreement was however never given effect to. It is always said that the procession was not to go beyond the railway gate. This is also admitted by the Hindus. Vide Pt. of Mudda Hanumaiya of Gande Mada before the Sub-divisional Magte. "We never took the Kama procession beyond the Railway gate." In 1906 March a license was for the first time given to the Gande mada people

is not correct. It has been disputed by the Hindus & the Mahomedans &c.

* Copy filed by Mr Lubeck.

&c

The * license given to the Gande mada people that year restricted the procession to the limits of their village.

There is a notification of the Govt of 4-4-1871 which requires minor roads to be stopped before mosques and burial grounds - when the Kama procession was held, the Hindu musicians stopped music near the burial ground but the Police officer advised that the music need not be stopped. The Police putting barricades against Mahamedans for two days caused them considerable hardship. The Police Supt & the Asst Collr rode across the burial ground.

The agreement of 1889 is disputed by the Hindus & the Mahomedans - The Mahamedans did not represent the

Mahomedan community. The Khaja was not one of them. The agreement made by 4 persons cannot ~~legally~~ legally bind the whole community. It may perhaps bind the 4 individuals, but it cannot ~~even~~ bind even their own descendants. Besides, for 17 years it has been a dead letter, hence having been given contrary bit.

There is no right in common law for anybody to go in procession through public places. This point has been incidentally referred to in the judgment of Justice Subrahmanya Ayyar in I.L.R. 26 Madras p 575 et seq.

(1) The agreement even if not legally binding on the whole community

(2) Even if it were, the application of the Hindus in subsequent years constitutes a waiver

(3) The local authorities never recognized it as valid.

The Mahomedans cannot desire to give unnecessary trouble to Hindus. If the Gandhi mata people want to go through the town people with the Rama procession let them go another way — not through Mahomedan streets.

53

Mr S. N. Ramaswamiengar, for the Hindus

We are not concerned with any excesses the Police may have committed.

The agreement was entered into by 4 Mahomedans on behalf of the community. The settlement

contained in it must have been in accordance with old ~~manual~~ manual. Apparently it is not a pronouncement creating new rights but has merely reduced to writing the existing manual.

[Mr Aubrey (interrupting). The agreement does not say that it is in accordance with the Manual]

The fact that we did not exercise our rights for a certain period does not mean that we have lost it. There is no law of limitation in respect of natural rights. In the year 1891 a license was given more or less in accordance with the terms of the agreement of 1884. If in subsequent years the license restricted ~~us~~ the Hindus up to the railway gate, it ~~was~~ may have been because they did not want to go beyond that — that was probably all that was applied for. The Gandemadan people were not on good terms with the town people, so they did not want to join with the latter.

As regards the judgment of Justice Subrahmanya Iyer, the Mysore country, in the Ullalu case, held that there are differences between the law in Mysore and that in British India, in the matter of processions.

The Hindus do not want to go with procession thro' the Mahomedan locality. The district magistrate does not enable them to do it. Hallows ~~them~~ the Hindus personally the streets occupied solely by them. Neither ~~do~~ the Hindus may bind to [illegible] any particular

5

route lead may be kept down — along streets in which only Hindus reside. They are strongly Mahomedan places of worship.

5th Mr Lubeck. (replying).

The license of 1891 does not follow the terms of the agreement. But if it did, the fact that it was set aside in 1892 (vide copy of letter) does not it has become a dead letter. If there was no agreement, what would the Govt. have done? They would have said "Follow the Manual". That is what we want to be done.

After the issue of the license of 1891, the Mahamadans raised objection to the procession coming beyond Gandi Naidu. There was some police record about it. It was in consequence of this objection that in subsequent years the license restricted the procession up to the railway gate.

There is a high street in Vannapatna solely occupied by Hindus. If there are the Mahamadans have no objection to the procession being taken along such streets

20/5/07

20/5/07

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. of 1906 07

Serial No.	
	53 Draft calling for certain records, as instructed by the 2nd Comr, putting. Issue [illegible] 20/5/07
423	Draft issued to the Dt. Magte. Bangalore no. J 35/3 Dy/ 21.5.07
448	From The Dt. Magte. Bangalore. no 8908 Dy/ 26.6.07 States that no correspondence appears to have taken place in the Police Dept. for conducting the procession through the Rly. gate & forwards extracts from certain License Registers with a copy of Inspr. [illegible] Genl. Diary and a copy of extract from the Criminal To Register

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—40,000—12 5-06

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Police File No. of 190 6-07

Serial No.

56 Subd. The papers were called for by the Hon Councillor.
BE 29.6.07 SN 29/6/07

2nd Councillor) APL 29/6

57 I have put up a draft of the G.O to be issued in the matter. Please submit the same to the Dewan for approval
APL 21/8/07

Dewan) BS 27.8.07 27/8 WWS 28.8

58 Issue
CB 5.9 WWS 5.9

Police 59 Please put up a draft endorsement to the Petitioners (thro' their Advocates)
BRW 25/9/07

SN 17/9/07 60 Subd. with two draft endorsements. 61 Issue
13.9. 17.9.07 WWS
SN 16/9/07

GDH 47,664—12-06.

Serial No.	
470	G.O. no. J 809 dt/ 9.9.07 to the Dt. Magte Bangalore Sets aside his order in the case
471	To Mr. S. N. Ramaswamiayyar, Advocate no. J 899 dt/ 19.9.07 Informs him of the above
472	To Mr. Lubeck, Bar-at-Law no. J 900 dt/19.9.07 Informs him of the same

Seen
19/9
3/10/07

GPB—40,000—12 5-06

(1) J 1475 J 1694

File no. 1706-07
SC no. 213

To.

The Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore.

The humble petition of Peer Sait and other Muhamadans, residing at Chennapatna, Bangalore District.

Most Respectfully Sheweth:-

(1) That the Hindus of Chennapatna applied to the Amildar for permission to go in procession with a " Kama" through every street in Chennapatna. including the street adjoining the Muhamadan place of worship, Makkan, and their residence.

(2) That the Amildar Magistrate rejected their petition.

(3) That the Hindus thereupon applied to the Sub-Division Officer, Closepet Range, and the District Magistrate, Bangalore District, for the privilege which the Amildar had refused to grant them. The District Magistrate sent the petition addressed to him to the Divisional Magistrate for disposal.

(4) That the Divisional Magistrate after due enquiry rejected the petition preferred by the Hindus as their prayer was absolutely contrary to Mamool.

(5) That thereupon they appealed to the District Magistrate, Bangalore, who has granted the prayer of the Hindus rescinding the order of the two lower Courts,

which

which is dangerous, impolitic and thoughtless.

(6) That the petitioners are pretty old and have had sufficient experience of the world and can restrain themselves even under the highest pressure of religious enthusiasm.

(7) That there are hundreds of young Muhamadans who cannot think for themselves and who cannot be restrained when their religious feelings are wounded.

(8) That it is to prevent their destruction and disgrace that the petitioners submit this, their humble petition.

(9) That the agreement of 1889 referred to by the District Magistrate is not binding on the Muhamadan community in as much as it was executed by only one Muhamadan who had no authority from the members of the community to do so.

(10) That that the Muhamadan community disregarded that agreement could be seen from the fact that the Hindu community did not act according to the agreement up to date.

(11) That this petition is addressed to Government, as the Chief Court cannot interfere with an order passed under Section 144 of the Code of Criminal procedure, that section being introduced for executive purposes.

(12) That the copies of licenses for 12 years granted to the Hindus were filed before the Sub-Divisional Magistrate to show that the said agreement was null and void.

(13) That copies of orders passed by the Sub-Divisional Magistrate and the District Magistrate are herewith submitted.

The

The petitioners, in conclusion, pray that the benign Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore will be pleased to save their children by forthwith issuing an order suspending the order of the District Magistrate passed in Criminal Miscellaneous case No. 22 A of 06-07, on the file of his court, and after enquiry, pass such orders as are consistent with good and Considerate administration. Urgent orders are earnestly solicited, as the Hindus are getting ready to carry their old Kama in procession

For which act of kindness, the petitioners shall ever pray

P.S. Licences annexed.

Dated.
17.12.06
Bangalore.

رجوع سید محمد حسینی بادرشاہ قادری

رجوع سید مستان شاہ قادری

رجوع مدد خان

رجوع حمید اللہ صاحب

رجوع سید عثمان

رجوع بہلول الدین خان

رجوع محمد قاسم انصاری

رجوع اختر علی خان

رجوع عبدالرزاق

رجوع محمد النعیم

رجوع محمد مبارک

رجوع رحیم خان

رجوع عبدالرزاق

رجوع سید یوسف

رجوع سید رسول

رجوع محمد اسحاق

A یہ علامت کنارگرفتہ محمد صاحب رجوع

رجوع عبداللہ خان

رجوع سید تبطب الدین صاحب

رجوع میر غلام حسین

رجوع محمد علی

رجوع بہلول محی الدین صاحب

رجوع محمد یوسف صاحب

رجوع مصطفیٰ خان

A یہ علامت کنارگرفتہ غیث صاحب

رجوع سید خواجہ بادشاہ

رجوع محمد ثانی محمد غوث صاحب

رجوع سید حسین

رجوع میر حیات

محمد پیر

بدھن خان سوری

غلام رسول

محمود خان کلرک

محمد محمود خان سوری

رجوع عبدالت عبدالقادر

رجوع اسحاق بیگ

رجوع محمد پیر صاحب رجوع

سید جان صاحب رجوع

رجوع شاہ علی

محمد

غلام محی الدین

رجوع بہمان محمد شاہ صاحب

رجوع محمد شاہ

رجوع محی الدین شاہ

غوث میاں صاحب سید حسن کے کاتب

محمود کلرک

رجوع اسحاق بیگ

رجوع سید یوسف

رجوع حیدر صاحب

رجوع بدن خان

رجوع محمد

رجوع صاحب

سید غلام صاحب عبدالاصل

سید حیدر رجوع

حسن بوسن

رجوع محمد پیر صاحب

یوسف خان مدرس

سید حسن

شیخ فی الدین رجوع

رجوع رسول خان

سید حسن رجوع

رجوع سید رسول کاتب

سید عبدالقادر رجوع

جی ایم سید عثمان رجوع

محمد عبداللطیف انصاری رجوع

باوا خان رجوع

رجوع محمد عبدالکریم

رجوع غلام احمد

جی غفار بیگ

عبدالحمید صاحب

محمود شریف رجوع

رجوع جان احمد

رجوع محی الدین صاحب

شریف صاحب

اسماعیل بیگ رجوع

مرتضیٰ بیگ رجوع

پیر بیگ رجوع

پویکر عبدالرحمان صاحب رجوع

میر جان اللہ رجوع

سید صاحب رجوع

عجب صاحب کا رجوع

پیر صاحب رجوع

صوفی ابن بیگ

رجوع غلام سرور عرف جیالال رجوع محمد

ہیر صاحب رجوع

رجوع جمالو لیں صاحب رجوع جمالو

رجوع حیات صاحب رجوع غوث

رجوع محمد صاحب

رجوع یوسف علی

رجوع فیض احمد صاحب

رجوع امت صاحب

رجوع احمد صاحب

کوٹا پور پیر صاحب رجوع

رجوع

دیگور بوڑھلیتی صاحب

رجوع علی صاحب

رجوع فاخ صاحب

رجوع فقیر صاحب

مکن پیر صاحب رجوع

رجوع یوسف صاحب

رجوع عبدالرحمان

رجوع عمر صاحب

(6) File no. 1706-07
Sl. no. 261

Mysore Govt. Genl. Rev. Secrt

~~MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.~~

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

No. J 2049 */17.1.07

En & Sail

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

(to be returned) The accompanying Petition No.* J 1694 dated the 17th Dec 1906 received ~~at the Dewan's Office~~ from Peer Saib and others of Channapatna, regarding the conduct of the Rama procession in Channapatna

*(to be returned) is forwarded, together with its ~~enclosures~~, enclosures, to the Dt. Magte. of Bangalore for report with the records of the case.

By order,

17/1/07

for Secretary.

BANGALORE,

The 189

Copies 2-
17/1/07

Pol 42 II 427 7 of 1915

1906.7 file no. 1706
GC no. 256

From

The Dist. Magistrate
Bangalore dist

To

The Secy. to Govt. of Mysore
Gen. & Rev. Depts

Dated 1st

Despatched 2 February 1907

Received

General No.

J No. 597

Enclosures No. 3 files
(2 files separately)

His No. J 2049 of 17.10.07

Reports with records
on the petition from Kaar
Saib and others of Channa
patna re the conduct of
the Kama procession in
Channapatna.

6

Bangalore District, District Magistrate's Offi

S. 597

Bangalore Dated 18th. February 1907

E. 15 Ca ~ 2 Feb
separately.

From,

H. H. Sparks, Esqr.
District magistrate
Bangalore District

To

K. S. Chandrekara Iyp. Esqr. BA, BL.
Secretary to the Government of
Mysore
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your official memo No. 2029 dated 17th. January 1907, forwarding for report petition from Pea Sab and others of Chennapatna, I have the honour to State that the Hindus of Chennapatna applied on 23-3-06 to the Assistant Commissioner magistrate of Closepet for a license for parading kamas and it was forwarded to the Amildar magistrate for disposal under Section 27 of the Police Rules. The Amildar magistrate of Chennapatna gave notices to the parties to hold an enquiry in the matter and as the party deposed before the Amildar that they would not meet with justice if the Case was tried before the Amildar he sent back the records to the

Assistant

Assistant Commissioner. Mean while, a petition on the same question was given to the District Magistrate and was forwarded to the Closepet Assistant Commissioner Magistrate for disposal. That Magistrate held an enquiry into the matter and ordered on 30-5-06 that license should not be granted to Conduct the Kama procession of different localities together, as it was Contrary to Mamool, but that each party might apply to the amildar to Conduct their procession of their particular Kama idol in localities formerly defined.

On this order petition was presented before the District Magistrate for the reversion of the Order passed by the 1st Class Magistrate in Charge of the Closepet Division. The District Magistrate in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 224 of 1906-07, set aside the order and directed that Kama procession be allowed as prayed for, and in accordance with the provisions laid down in the agreement of 1889 (vide order in the Case the records of which are enclosed for ready reference).

The

The Vernacular papers, the records of Criminal Miscellaneous No. 224 of 06-07 on the file of my Court, and Criminal Miscellaneous No: 43 of 05-06, on the file of the Assistant Commissioner Magistrate together with the enclosures received with the memo under reply are herewith submitted.

On the representation of the Musalmans that my order might be held in abeyance pending the disposal of the appeal before Government, I have instructed the Amildar accordingly

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

H H Sparke

District Magistrate

with Bangalore District

J 1965 II

File no. 1706
Sl no. 2

To

The Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore

The humble petition of Peer Saib,
residing at the Fort, Chennapatam,
Bangalore District

Most respectfully showeth —

(1) That the petitioner and others sent a petition to Government against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, permitting some classes of the Hindus in Chennapatam, to carry their Rama in procession through all the streets in Chennapatam, which order was impolitic and entirely opposed to custom.

(2) That the District Magistrate based his order upon an agreement entered into by one Mahammadan.

(3) That the other Mohammadans repudiated this agreement may be seen from the licenses granted to the Hindus subsequently to the agreement, the Mohammadan Community as a body opposing the arrangement.

12

The petitioner humbly prays that the petition presented by him and other Mohammadans may be disposed of early.

4. 2. 07

J 1986 12

file no. 1706-07
Sl no. 258

Found in the
petition box
7.2.07

T 1986

file no. 1908-01
gl no. 264

14

No. 9247

MYSORE GOVT. GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT,
Dated, Bangalore, 18th Feb 1907

ENDORSEMENT GRANTED TO Mr. S. N. Ramaswamiengar Advocate, Bangalore, counsel for Pasare Venkataramaniah of Channapatna in reply to his Petition Registered No. T 1986 dated the 7th February 1907, praying for a copy of the petition of Peer Sab & other Mahomedans of Channapatna re the Consecration of the Rama procession of the place

Petitioner is informed that the copy applied for will be granted on payment of a copying fee of Ten annas.

By Order,

Secretary.

15/2/07

15/2/07

Copy ready 16/2

2187

1—3—07

Pol 1—06
—281.

To

The Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of
Mysore
General and Revenue department

The humble petition of Peer Saib and other Muhamadans residing at Chennapatna Bangalore District

Most respectfully Sheweth:—

(1) That the Deputy Commissioner and District Magistrate, Bangalore district, permitted the Hindus of Chennapatna to carry their God "Rama" in procession throughout the streets in Chennapatna against long established custom.

(2) That thereupon the old and thoughtful Mohamadans sent a humble petition to Government to cancel the order of the said Deputy Commissioner and District Magistrate.

(3) That in the meantime they intimated to the said district magistrate and Deputy Commissioner that they had appealed to Government ~~his order~~ praying that his order might be kept in abeyance pending the disposal of their petition to Government.

16

(4) That the said District Magistrate and Deputy Commissioner kindly granted their prayer but for some reasons unknown to the Petitioners suddenly changed his mind and has given orders, that his original order should be carried out

The Petitioners therefore pray that the Government will be pleased to direct that the order of the District Magistrate and Deputy Commissioner permitting "Rama" Procession may be kept in abeyance pending the disposal of their petition to Government

Petitioner

1. 3. 07.

Ls. Pol 1906
St No. 285 17

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

No. J 2670 of 2.3.07
Encl

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. J 1181 dated the 1st March 1907 received ~~at the Dewan's Office~~ from Peer Sab and other mahomedans of Channapatna, praying that the order of the District Magistrate permitting the "Kama" procession to pass two certain streets at Channapatna may be suspended is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures~~, to the District Magistrate of Bangalore for a very early report

2/3/07.

By order,

2/3/07
BANGALORE, 189

Secretary.

The

2/3/07
2/3

18

T 2204

Code. Class. Phil 14/6/07

INDIAN TELEGRAPHS.

Monthly. Number. 19

To (Office) Bellary | From (Office) channapatna

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instructions.
47	2	17	16	

file no. 1906
Sl no. 286

To (Person) Second Councellor | From (Person) mohamedans

amildar police inspetor feneed owr ways to tank bazaar from yesterday Starving what offered by nioslt loyal & lawobdying Peaceful mohamedan Subjects hindus with reserve policed carried then Ramas without mamood through mohamedan street with great respect we implore justice

T. 14a.

CHANNARAJENDRAPET 2 MA. 08

Telegraph Master.

* In foreign telegrams the *Person from*, if telegraphed, should be written after, but separated from the text.

19

Code Class. P

INDIAN TELEGRAPHS.

Monthly Number 00373

To (Office)	From (Office)
ce	Channapatna

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instructions.
95		16	58.	

To (Person)	From (Person)
Nevoan rupsore state	7th a.s. 1 dot SL no. 286A Mohamedan

amildar police inspector
heard our cry's to
touch feet from yesterday
evening that whence of
most loyal x lawabiding x
peaceful mohamadans subjects
hindus with curve police
armed hamees without mamool
brought two mohamadan
streets with great respect
we implore justice.

64 Word Fo

Recd. from BANGAL Sent to LN.

Hrs. Mins. by At Hrs. Mins. by

07

Telegraph Master.

K.—In foreign Telegrams the Person from if telegraphed should be written after, but separated from the text. This form must accompany any enquiry respecting this telegram.

G G P—No 1167 T—2 11 1908—7206600

20 III 28.3 J 2247

Phil 1906-7

File no. 1906
Sl no. 301

From

The Dy. commissioner
Bangalore Dist.

To

The Secy to Govt. of Mysore
Gen. Revenue Dept

Dated 7

Despatched March 1907

Received

General No.

S No. 683

Enclosure No. 1 file

His No. D 2670 of 2.3.07
POC 1906

Report on the petition
of Peer Sab & others praying for the
suspension of the Kanoon
proceedings.

21

Bangalore District.
District Magistrate's Office.
Bangalore 7th March 1907.

S.No 683
E. No

From

H. H. Sparkes Esquire
District Magistrate.
Bangalore District

To

K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar Esquire B.A. B.L.
Secretary to the Government of Mysore.
General & Revenue Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 2670/Pol. 1 of 06 dated 2nd March/07, calling for a report on the petition of Peer Sab of Channapatna, praying for the suspension of the Kanna processions at Channapatna, I have the honor to invite your attention to my letter No. S. 597 dated 1st February/07 intimating that it was decided in Criminal Miscellaneous case No. 22 A. of 1906-07 on the file of my court that the Kanna processions

might

might be held in accordance with the provisions laid down in the agreement of 1889. (A copy of the agreement is also contained in the records forwarded with my above letter).

2. As the Muharam and Hana festivities occurred at the same time this year, I paid a visit to Channapatna on the 22nd February/07 for inspection to gauge the situation personally.

3. On receipt of report No. 210 of 26th February 1907 from the Amildar Magistrate of Channapatna recommending the grant of licenses for Kana processions on the 1st and 2nd March 1907, I sent orders to the Magistrate to issue licenses in strict conformity with the terms of the

the Agreement of 1889.

4. I at the same time issued the needful instructions to the Assistant Commissioner and 1st class Magistrate, Closepet Sub Division and to the District Superintendent of Police

5. The telegrams of the 1st class Magistrate, and of the Amildar dated 2nd March/07, and the said Assistant Commissioner Magistrates' letter No. 130 dated 3rd March/07 and the Amildar Magistrates' English report No. 217 received to day, stating that the processes passed off smoothly, are herein enclosed for reference and return along with the records sent to you with my letter No. S. 597 (vide supra)

6. The Sketch shewing the Routes taken by the Hanna processes

is also contained in the records now sent.

In conclusion I may invite your attention to the Statement in the Assistant Commissioners Magistrate's letter that there was no objection in the matter of these processes on the part of the Dayaes of Channapatna

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant

H H Sparkes
District Magistrate
Bangalore District

(25) J 2246

file no. 1906
Sl no. 302

Parry's Buildings, Madras.

March 7th. 1907

From

H. Lubeck Esq. B.A., LL.B.
Barrister-at-law

To

K.S. Chendrasekhara Aiyer Esq. B.A., B.L.
Secretary, General and Revenue Department,
Government of Mysore
Bangalore.

Sir,

I have been retained by certain Mahomedan residents of Chennapatna to appear before the Council of H.H. the Maharajah of Mysore in connection with a Petition to His Highness' Government recently submitted by them through one Peer Saib of Chennapatna, regarding the alleged right of certain members of the Hindu community of the same town to go in procession during the "Kama" Festival through the Mahomedan quarter of Chennapatna, especially past Mahomedan cemeteries and their places of public worship, contrary to established "mamool" (custom). I am informed that the local authorities, viz. the Amildar Magistrate and the Ist. Class Magistrate of the Closepet Range (the latter in Cr. Mis. No. 43 of 1905-06) decided in favor of the Mahomedan community, by refusing to grant to the Hindu applicants a license to go in procession with all their "Kamas" except in certain "prescribed" streets according to long-existing custom. In revision, the District Magistrate of Bangalore set aside the lower Court's order. (Cr. Mis. Case No. 22A of 1906-07). It is this last order that has been appealed against to H.H's Government, and I have been asked to represent the Petitioners when their Petition comes on for consideration.

May I ask the favor of being informed when the matter is likely to come on before His Highness' Council. ?

To my clients, who form a very large section of the Chennapatna public, the matter is a serious one, and I trust I shall be allowed to appear for them when the Council meet.

Having appeared for the Mahomedan accused in a Chennapatna riot case in 1889, I know something of the facts of which they now complain. My clients, who are law-abiding subjects of His Highness, would prefer to have all matters now in dispute settled by H.E. the Dewan without their being forced to court unnecessary litigation. Their one desire is to have their customary rights respected, and to live at peace with their Hindu neighbours.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant

M. Lukes.

38 2(0 mas
2-3-07
Pleader

(27) J 2268

File no 1701
Sl no: 303

To
The Dewan of Mysore
Bangalore.

Received from the Dewan's office 9.3.07

The humble petition of Peer Sahib on behalf of the Mahammadans of Channapatna wheresides in Channapatna

Most Respectfully Sheweth

(1) That the Deputy Commissioner and District Magistrate Bangalore District, permitted the Hindus residents of Channapatna to carry their Ganesha in procession against Mamool.

(2) That the Mahammadans thereupon sent a petition against that act of the Deputy Commissioner and District Magistrate who consented to hold his order in abeyance untill the disposal of their petition to Government

(3) That while the Mahammadans were waiting for the order of the government the Deputy Commissioner and District Magistrate for some reason unknown to Mahammadans suddenly changed his mind and gave order that his original order against Mamool should be carried out

(4) That accordingly the Amildar Magistrate and police Inspector prohibited Mahammadans from going to the Bazaar and Tank and caused them to confine themselves to their houses The Mahammadan roads being fenced

The petitioner most humbly prays that inquiries may be made and the legal request of the loyal Mahammadan subjects to keep up the Mamool which is not only in Mysore province but also in most of the Indian towns known to your honour, may be fulfilled for it is, in their humble opinion, quite necessary to the welfare of the town. So long as the Mamool was observed there was no misunderstanding between the Hindus and Mahammadans which will be seen by the records submitted to Government

S.C. Ananda Rao Esqr The then Subdivisional officer of Channapatna passed an order to keep up the Mamool after going minutely through the whole records submitted to government.

4/3/07

petitioner

29 ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ
14 — 3 — 07
ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲ 5 ಗಂಟೆ

30 ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ
14 — 3 — 07
ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲ 5 ಗಂಟೆ

(28) J 2330

file no. 1958
Sl no. 814

The Government of His Highness
the Maharajah of Mysore.

The humble petition of Peer Saib, Landholder, Mohideen Sahib, Merchant, Mirza Gouse Beg Sahib, Merchant, and the other undersigned Mahamadan residents of Chennapatna Town, in the Bangalore District, supplementary to the Petition dated ..... submitted by the said Petitioners.

Most Respectfully and Humbly Sheweth:

1. That by their petition dated ..... (copy hereunto annexed and marked A.) with reference to the then intruded (Hindu) Kama processions within the Mahamadan Mohalla of Chenrapatna, contrary to long-established and well-recognized Mamool (custom), the petitioners submitted:

(a) that the Amildar-Magistrate (Mr. Ramachandra Rao) had disallowed as contrary to Mamool the petition of the Yelakere (Gendimadu) Hindu residents of Chennapatna for a license to proceed in procession with their Kama deities past the Railway Gate and through the Mahamadan Mohalla.

(b) That the Divisional Magistrate (Mr. Sirsi Ananda Rao) on appeal confirmed the Amildar's order.

(c)

(c) That on revision the District Magistrate who seemed to have misunderstood the actual facts quashed the order of the local Magistracy and allowed the license applied by the Hindu Petitioners.

(d) That the license granted by the District Magistrate was inequitable and fraught with danger to the public -- peace, as it was an innovation, and calculated to rouse religious antipathies , by reason of the fact that the procession (accompanied by noise obscenity and confusion in the immediate vicinity of burial grounds, mosques etc) ~~xxx~~ would amount to an outrage on the minds of the younger generation of Mahamadans in particular in the thickly populated Mohallas.

2. That as no orders from Government were received, the Petitioners were constrained in the circumstances existing at the time to send the following telegraphic messages, sent on the 30th January 1907 (vide copy attached).

3. That with the view of setting before the Government the facts relating to what has subsequently occurred and in the fervent hope that His Highness Government will give due and favourable consideration to the Petitioners' grievances as a whole, the petitioners crave leave to submit as follows:-

(a) On or about the 22nd February 1907 the Police Inspector (Mr. Nataraja Iyer) of Chennapatna said to some of the Petitioners that he expected the Mahamadans to help the Hindus to celebrate their Holi festival. The reply was that nothing would be done in violation of the law, and that the Petitioners were waiting for orders on their Memorial to His Highness's Government, against the District Magistrate's order-which was an innovation as being contrary to Mamool The Police Inspector thereupon said in

effect

30

effect as follows:-

" If there is no Mamool, see I will create a Mamool. I will conduct the Holi procession through your streets. If you cause the slightest obstruction, you will pay dearly for it. I will be the first to shoot you down." The Police Inspector seemed to be in an irritable and most xxx aggressive mood. But Petitioners preferred to say nothing more. The leaders of the Mahamedans did their best to caution their co-religionists against any act of obstruction or even against showing any annoyance. Perfect submission was enjoined on all Mahamedans who were told that they might rest assured that His Highness's Government would consider their grievances justly; and the following telegrams were despatched, first to the Councillor, second to the Deputy Commissioner, and the third to the District Superintendent of Police.

6 (b) On or about the 1st of March 1907, the Mahamadan residents of the Mohalla were greatly surprised to find their principal ways of egress and ingress barred by several bamboo fences across the roadways in their quarter of the town as indicated in the sketch hereunto annexed. The result was general inconvenience and in many instances misery. Trade was at a stand-still, for no business could be done with outside villages; market supplies were not procurable; many starved; access to the Kunnirkatta Tank for water was practically cut off; and, worse still, infants in arms suffered from want of milk which was usually brought in from outside -- villages. The Mahamadan Girls' School was practically closed. Policemen armed with loaded guns were picketted outside the fences.? This created the public impresiion that the Mohalla was in a state of seize. People could hardly realize the necessity for all these extraordinary proceedings of the Police which continued without intermission for two days-viz. the 1st and 2nd March, until the public Holi festivities ended.

(c)

(c) On or about the 2nd March 1907 during the Holi festivities, certain public officials, namely (Amildar Mr. Parthasarathy Iyengar and Police Inspector Mr. Nataraja Iyer) rode on horseback across the Mahamedan cemetry near the Railway gate, instead of going along the main road. They did this probably because the Police had barred the road further down by a fence (vide Sketch-Fence I.) Whatever the cause, such an act was a gross outrage on the minds and feelings of Mahamedans, as a cemetry is regarded by them as a sacred spot which should never be polluted by the feet of those of an alien creed.

(d) When the Kama procession, which emerged from the Hindu quarter (Gendimadu Yelekere) and passed through (for the 1st time) the Railway crossing, the Hindu musicians, out of some personal good feeling and respect probably, stopped their music as they were about passing by the side of the Mahamedan burial ground. But a Police Officer (the District Superintendent of Police) ordered the musicians to continue their drums and music past the burial ground. Thereupon Sahukar Shaik Mohideen Saib, a leading Mahamedan resident, ventured to remonstrate with the District Superintendent of Police by saying that the Mamool was being infringed. The only reply he got from the said Police Officer was the angry and offensive remark, " Damn the Mamool" or words to that effect. Notwithstanding this the Mahamedans at this place remained perfectly still .

(e) This year for the first time the Police authorities urged the Desai people, who live to the south of the Mahamadan Mohalla and who usually stopped their processions along the Mysore road at their boundary (marked in the sketch annexed) to proceed unnecessarily further about two furlongs along the road to the Fort up to the Mosque there. Here, at the mosque, by design evidently, the din and noise and obscene shouting-which are the usual concomitants of the

the Kama festivities, exceeded all bounds. It seemed very much as if the processionists were incited by the Police to provoke the Mahamedans to resent what was an unprecedented outrage-as the sanctity of the place was not respected and no prayers could possibly be proceeded with in the Mosque. It all seemed to be a deliberate challenge. But still the Mahamedans were persuaded by their leaders, not without some difficulty, to remain perfectly quiet, in the fervent hope that their rights would be protected by a paternal Government.

(f) The Kama processions during the Holi festival are usually attended with much noise mingled with gross obscene expressions shouted out by the excited processionists. But on the present occasion the practical invasion of the Mahamedan quarter seemed to have given the processionists more zeal in the direction of out-doing their previous ordinary demonstrations; and that in such an aggressive manner as to rouse against them public feelings of resentment among the Mahamedans of the Mohalla.

(g) The petitioners understnad and believe that the local authorities have given out that the Police were armed and picketted in the Mohalla to prevent excesses on the part of the excited Hindu processionists. But petitioners crave leave to submit that the representation, if true, is a gross -- fallacy, to say the least and opposed to facts. The ~~XXXX~~ Police were there, armed to the teeth, to terrorize the Mahamedans in pursuance no doubt of the Police Inspector's first violent threat of"shooting down" referred to in para 3 (a) above, and probably also to fasten on the Mahamedans, in case of need, grave responsibilities -a scheme that in the circumstances was unjustifiable and mischievous in the extreme.

(h) Not content with the arbitrary action hitherto taken in connection with the Holi (Kama) festivities , the Police

Inspector

Inspector, your petitioners are informed and believe, is endeavouring to show his power in other arbitrary ways and in such manner as to plausibly account for his needlessly aggressive and malicious actions herein complained against and again likely to follow. One of these is a contemplated attempt to make Peer Saib (one of the respectable landholders of Chennapatna, chosen as one of the Petitioners' spokesman) appear as a man of dangerous character, who -- ought to be bound over to keep the peace. This is evidently an ingenious scheme, Petitioners submit, to misrepresent the cause of the petitioners as a body in the eyes of the Government. The Petitioners humbly submit that the petition already presented and this petition contains the expression of the views of the entire Mahamedan community of Chennapatna-about 5,000 persons (one half of the entire population), and that Peer Saib is no agitator in the matter as the Police seem inclined to make out. The Petitioners are quite willing to exclude Peer Saib altogether if their cause is to suffer in any way by any representation or misrepresentation against him or any other person the Police may choose to find a handle against.

(i) During the practical seize of Chennapatna for two days by armed Policemen, the Petitioners were absolutely unable to attend to their ordinary avocations. Furthermore they suffered still more seriously by being prevented from atten-ding their mosques. The following telegrams, may serve to explain very briefly the general situation of affairs at Chennapatna on the 2nd March 1907-one to His Highness the Maharajah, another to the Dewan, 3rd to the Councillor, and the 4th to the Deputy Commissioner. (Copy attached here-unto).

Wherefore Petitioners most humbly pray that the Govern-ment will be pleased to take into consideration all the salient facts hereinbefore represented, and pass such orders

orders as will restore the status quo ante, that is as matters stood prior to the District Magistrate's order in G,Mis. No. 22.A of .9.6.97. The Petitioners would humbly submit that their main prayer is only that they may have continued to them the right, hitherto enjoyed by them from time immemorial, of having their burial-grounds and places of public worship respected, especially on the occasion of practically riotous demonstrations such as occur at the Kama festival; that they may be allowed the liberty of exercising, unmolested and undisturbed, their own religious observances and they might not be made the victims of public hatred and contempt by the over-zealous if not malicious action of the new local authorities, whose recent action as hereinbefore set forth is much to be deplored as impolitic and highly mischievous. The Petitioners venture to submit further that perhaps the few zealots among the Hindu Yelakere applicants for the extended license were not so keen as to have a concession at the expense of the Petitioners extended to them, as the Police Inspector aided by his Jemadar and other underlings, who were apparently deter-mined on having their own way in the matter of subjecting the Petitioners to perpetaal disgrace and loss of their religious and social rights, Having the power and might they have endeavoured to screen ~~the~~ their actions by plausible pretexts in favour of the Hindu community. The Hindus and Mahamedans have hitherto both lived happily in --- Chennapatna; and it is the desire of the Petitioners to continue to live at peace with their Hindu brethren. If the causes-now newly brought into being and fostered by a few mischievous men-leading to religious animosity and racial antagonism be removed by the restoration of the Status Quo Ante, Petitioners believe that both the Hindu and Mahamedan subjects of His Highness will have cause to be highly grateful to His Highness's Government.

رجوع جمال الدین صاحب کے فرزند پیر حسن

رجوع عبید

محی الدین صاحب بن ابو صاحب

رجوع مدد خان بارہ دوکان

رجوع سید قطب الدین

رجوع محمد قاسم

رجوع سید پیر

رجوع عبد الغفور

رجوع اکبر خان

رجوع صاحب

رجوع سید رسول

رجوع سید یوسف

رجوع سید حبیب

رجوع عشق خان کاکڑ

رجوع غلام رسول

عبد القدوس

رجوع محمد [illegible]

رجوع محمد پیر

[illegible]

رجوع عبد الرزاق

رجوع سید عبد الرحمن

رجوع سید پیر حسن

رجوع سید عبد الرزاق صاحب

رجوع سید [illegible] صاحب

رجوع سید عثمان

رجوع محمود خان

رجوع عبد العزیز

رجوع پیر صاحب

رجوع امام خان

رجوع جان احمد

رجوع شریف صاحب

رجوع محی الدین صاحب

رجوع سید عبد الرحمن

رجوع اکبر الدین

رجوع محمد الدین

رجوع داود بیگ

رجوع بابا خان

رجوع اسماعیل خان

رجوع سلمان صاحب

آ صاحب

غوث خان رجوع

رجوع رزاق بیگ

جمال صاحب

شیخ محی الدین

رجوع سید حسن

رجوع سید حسن

رجوع سید یوسف

رجوع سید [illegible] صاحب

رجوع قلندر بیگ

رجوع امیر حسین

[illegible]

رجوع غفور صاحب

رجوع [illegible]

رجوع عبد الحق خان

[illegible]

عبد الرزاق

رجوع صاحب پادشاہ

رجوع [illegible]

رجوع حسن شاہ قادری

[illegible]

رجوع غلام حسین خان

رجوع سید عبد الرزاق

سید [illegible] رجوع

رجوع میر ابراہیم

رجوع سید [illegible]

رجوع [illegible]

رجوع سید محمد حسنی بادشاہ قادری

رجوع سید قادر بادشاہ رجوع داود

عبد اللہ حاجی صاحب رجوع

رجوع پیر جان

رجوع سید پاک شاہ

رجوع سید عبد الرزاق صاحب

رجوع سید [illegible] صاحب

رجوع احمد علی خان
رجوع برہان الدین خان
رجوع بزرگ صاحب بھدوی
عبدالغنی خان
میاں داد خان
رجوع ۱۹۰۰ سال بیگ
اکرام خان
محجان خان
دولت بیر صاحب
مجموع محجانو خان
یا بو صاحب
رجوع عبدالرحمن صاحب
رجوع پیر صاحب
رجوع پیر بیگ
کمو صاحب
باجو صاحب
عمر صاحب رجوع
لنجی کتے برہان الدین
رجوع پیر صاحب
یعقوب صاحب
رجوع عبدالکریم
فقیر دین
امیر خان
عبدالرحیم
عبدالغفور صاحب
الشفع خان
پروفیسر ہیرالد
رحمان خان
رجوع محمد حسین
بڈھن خان رجوع
رجوع ابو یوسف
رجوع پیر خان
رجوع محمد حیات
پیر احمد
بشیر احمد
رجوع حیات خان
رجوع عالم خان
رجوع لال خان
رجوع محبوب علی خان
رجوع شیر داد خان
رجوع محجان گیر
رجوع محمد خان
چاوڑی مجاور پیر صاحب
حسین صاحب رجوع
رجوع یوسین صاحب
رجوع محمد حسین
بکر قصاب پیر صاحب

رجوع محمد قاسم ہاشم تاجر
رجوع پیر صاحب
رجوع پیر بخش صاحب
رجوع محمد حیات
رجوع حسین خان
رجوع پیر بخش
رجوع محمد خان
رجوع پیر بخش خان
رجوع شیر بیگ قلندر بخش
رجوع ہاشم بیگ قلندر حسین
رجوع شیخ نابو یوسف علی خان
حسین خان
مصطفیٰ صاحب
برہان صاحب
علی خان
رجوع گل حسن خان
رجوع فخر اللہ خان
عمر خان صاحب
رجوع مجی الدین صاحب
رجوع صاحبجان
رجوع محمد علی خان
رجوع یوسف خان

رجوع محمد خان
رجوع پیر بخش
رجوع حسین خان
رجوع محمد خان
رجوع پیر بخش خان
رجوع شیر بیگ قلندر بخش
رجوع ہاشم بیگ قلندر حسین
رجوع شیخ نابو یوسف علی خان
حسین خان
کتا رغوث صاحب
رسول خان رجوع
دیشم سوداگر داؤد
رجوع مصطفیٰ صاحب
رجوع قاسم خان
رجوع شیخ محمد
رجوع غفار بیگ
رجوع سوداگر غفار بیگ
رجوع سوداگر محمد علی خان
رجوع یوسف خان

حوالدار رجوع محمد جلال	رجوع محمد امام	رجوع امروز خان
رجوع حیات صاحب	محمد صاحب رجوع	رجوع صفدر علیخان
رجوع حسن صاحب	ملک صاحب رجوع	
رجوع گلاول پیر صاحب	اخوند قادر صاحب	محمد طاہر
رجوع محی الدین صاحب	محمد اصغر خوشنویس صاحب	محمد طاہر انصاری
رجوع عظیم محی الدین		سید تمر رس
رجوع یحیان محمد صاحب	عمر صاحب دکاندار	A کتاری رجوع صاحب
رجوع قاسم صاحب	رجوع محمد جلال	رجوع سید صاحب
رجوع اللہ دیو علی صاحب	رجوع میان رات خان	A کتاری رجوع عبید
رجوع فتح احمد	رجوع کریم صاحب	رجوع علی ابن صاحب
رجوع محمد صاحب	رجوع پیر صاحب	A کتاری رجوع یوسف صاحب
رجوع پیر صاحب	A رجوع شیر خان	A کتاری حیدر خان
رجوع پیر صاحب	رجوع	
رجوع یعقوب صاحب	رجوع	محمد رحمان
رجوع قاسو میان	رجوع عبدالرحمن	ن خان
رجوع احمد صاحب	رجوع محمد	سید حسین
رجوع سلطان بڈھن صاحب		سلیمان خان
رجوع	محمود صاحب	A برہان الدین
رجوع فقیر صاحب	A رجوع فقیر صاحب	محمد غوث
رجوع کوشنو بار	یوسف خان	عبدالکریم
رجوع پیر صاحب		زین دین
رجوع محمد پیر صاحب	A برہان الدین	ہاوری صاحب
رجوع محمد صاحب	محمد اللہ	قادر بخش
رجوع عبدالکریم	رجوع	محمد اسحاق
رجوع پیر محمد	غلام عباس	ابراہیم خان
	رجوع غوث صاحب	میتر پیر دیو
		A رجوع عثمان خان

2351

file no. 1906
M no 320

(38)

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

No. 2/89/2

Dated The Palace, Mysore, 6-3-1907.

Telegram dated 2-3-1907, from Khadirbadsha and other M Mahammadans of Channapatna, is forwarded with compliments to the Dewan of Mysore, Mysore, for favour of disposal.

B.C.,

P. Raghavendrarao.
For. Offg: Private Secretary

Pn.No.1146 of 06-07.

Code Class. } CP

INDIAN TELEGRAPHS.

Monthly Number. } 80

To (Office) Mysore City

From (Office) Channapatna

Words.	Day	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instructions.
43	2	21	20	Urgt (1146)

To (Person) His Highness Maharajah

From (Person) Mohammad

mildar police inspector fenced our
Ways to tank bazaar from yesterday
starving what offence of Royal peace
Mohamadan streets with reserve
police carried Kamas unusually
through Mohamadan streets respectfully
implore justice kindly inform his
Highness

Read, from LN. Sent to LN.

At Hrs. Mts. by

MYSORE CITY 23 07

Bhimaya

Telegraph Master.

32 Word form. N.C.

47

To H. H. Maharaja Bahadur G. C. S. I.

From Khadirbad Cher Mahamada Channapatna

Dewan absent amildar police-inspector fenced roads to tank bazaar starving for trivial mahamadans disgraced without offence with reserve police carried Cama through Mahamadan streets unusually- Pray judge-

MYSORE CITY 23 07

Read. from P.S. LN. Sent to 3.01 LN

At Hrs. Mts. by At Hrs. Mts by

Bhimaya.

Telegraph Master.

32 Word form. N.C.

* In foreign telegrams the Person from, if telegraphed, should be written after, but separated from the text.

G P—No 318 T—27.7 1005—400000

'ok' file no. 178
sl no. 331

40

Mysore Govt. Genl & Rev. Secrtt.

~~MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.~~

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

No. J 3020/Genl file

dt 26-3-07

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

(to be returned when done with)

The accompanying ~~undated~~ Petition No. J 2 3 ~~50~~ 51

~~dated~~ received ~~at the~~

~~Dewan's Office~~ from Peer Sab and other inhabitants of Channapatna ~~regarding the Kyama tax collected from processions of Channapatna~~

is forwarded, together with its ———— enclosures, to the Dt. Magte. of Bangalore for report through the D.G. of Police in Mysore,

(to be returned when done with)

By order,

for Secretary.

28/3/07

BANGALORE,

The 189

Typed Copy sent 24/3/07

B.G. 28-3-07

4/1
Police

G.R.S. 26}

File No. 1/76
Serial No. 370

Diary No. of letter replied to 2117

No. J 30 76
Encl 2 files

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
, *the* 190 .

To
The Dt. Magte. of Bangalore

Date of issue 4-4-07

Signed by [illegible]

Has the honor to return herewith the records received with his letters nos. S 577 dt/ the 16th February 07 and S 683 dated the 7th March respectively, 07 regarding the Channapatna Kanne procession and to request that a full ~~detailed and connected~~ report ~~on the matter~~ with the circumstances of the case together with the entire ~~enclosed~~ records of the case may be forwarded to this office at an early date. ~~Say~~ By order

—Say by the 20th April 1907.

SUBJECT.
B.G.
1.4.07

for Secretary

(42) Pkro. 71

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE
Regr. No. 827
1906
Date 26-4-07

From The Dist. Magistrate
Bangalore Dist.
file no. 378/98
Slno. 379

To The Secy. to Govt. of Mysore
Genl. Dept.

Dated 24.

Despatched April 1907.

Received

General No.

No. 793.

1 memo
3 files
Enclosure No. 2 records in a sealed cover

---

this No. D 3020 of 26.3.07
Pol. 1906

—

Reports with records on the petition of Peer Sab and Abdul Chan napatna in re the Conduct of the Kama procession

no: 7558/799 of 26.4.07

Forwarded

J C Cunn
Inspr Genl of Police
in Mysore
26. 4. 07

43 Through the Inspector General of Police in Mysore.

Office of the District Magistrate,

C.No. 793. Bangalore District.

Dated Bangalore, 24th April 1907.

From,

H. H. Sparkes Esquire

District Magistrate,

Bangalore District.

To

K.S.Chandrasekhara Aiyar Esquire, B.A.,B.L.,

Secy.to the Govt.of H.H.the Maharaja of Mysore,

General and Revenue Departments.

Sir

In reply to your Memo.No.J.3020/Pol.1 of 06 dated the 26th ultimo forwarding for report through the Inspector General of Police in Mysore Petition No.J.2330 from Peer Sab and others making certain allegations in re the conduct of the Kama procession at -- Chennapatna in March last,I have the honor to report as follows :-

2. The Hindus of Chennapatna applied on 23rd March 1906 to the Assistant Commissioner Magistrate of Closepet for a license for parading kamas and it was forwarded to the Amildar Magistrate for disposal under Section 27 of the Police Rules. The Amildar Magis- 71 -trate of Chennapatna with a view to enquire into the matter gave notices to the parties to appear before him with the evidence in support of their petition and as one party deposed before the Amildar that they would not meet with justice if the case ~~was~~ were tried before the Amildar, he sent back the records to the Assistant Commissioner. Meanwhile a petition on the same subject was given to the District Magistrate and it was forwarded to the Closepet Assistant Commis- -sioner Magistrate for disposal. That Magistrate held an enquiry into the matter and ordered on 30th May 1906 that license should not be granted to parade the kamas of different localities together as it was contrary to mamool, but that each party might apply to the Amildar for a license to conduct the procession of their particular kama idol in prescribed routes and localities. On this a petition was presented before the District Magistrate for the revision of the above

above order of the 1st Class Magistrate of the Closepet Division. The District Magistrate in Criminal Miscellaneous Case No.22 A of 1906-07 set aside the order on 24th November 1906 and direct-ed that a license should be issued allowing the petitioners to conduct the procession as prayed for by them in accordance with the provisions laid down in the agreement of 1889. A copy of the agreement is in the enclosed records.

2. Against this order, an appeal was preferred to Government by the Mahomedans of the place. On the representation of the lat-ter that my order might be held in abeyance pending the disposal of the appeal before Government, I instructed the Amildar Magis-trate accordingly, in my order No. 1365 of 31.1.07. All this was reported in my letter No.S.597 of 1st February 1907. As the Moharum and Kama festivities occured this year at the same time I paid a visit to Chennapatna on the 22nd February '07 for inspection and to gauge the situation personally. On receipt of report No.210 of 26th February 1907 from the Amildar Magis-trate recommending the grant of licenses for Kama processions on the 1st & 2nd March 1907, I sent orders on 28th February 1907 to the Magistrate to issue licenses in strict conformity with the terms of the agreement of 1889 (Vide typed copy of order herein enclosed) and at the same time issued the needful instructions to the Assistant Commissioner and 1st Class Magistrate and to the District Superintendent of Police. I received telegrams on the 2nd March from the Assistant Commissioner Magistrate as well as from the Amildar Magistrate that everything passed off smooth-ly. Detailed reports were also received to the same effect. (Vide Assistant Commissioner Magistrate's letter No.130 of 3rd March 1907 and Amildar Magistrate's report No.217 of the same date). It will be seen from the Assistant Commissioner Magis-trate's letter that there was no objection in the matter of these processions from the Doyare Mussalmans who form the majo-rity of the Mussalmen community. These facts have been reported in my letter No.S.683 of 7th March 1907.

45

4. Coming now to the allegations made in the petition sent with the memo under reply I herewith send in original the District Police Superintendent's memo explaining fully the scrupulous -- regard which the Police always displayed for the feelings of -- both parties. If it be true that Police Officers insulted the Mahomedans as alleged in the petition, they would certainly have complained to the higher officers then on the spot. As regards the barricadings they were only got up as is done in the cities on all such occasions, to prevent the rush of people and spaces were left for people to pass in sihgle row. Neither was it re--tained for a moment longer than was necessary and no inconve--nience whatever is reported to have resulted from it. The Police Superintendent's memo clearly shows that all the other allegations made in the petition are misstatements.

5. The Amildar in paras 4 & 5 of his report No.276 of [redacted] April 1907 (herewith sent) states that one Kama went some dis--tance beyond the mamool, after consulting in the matter one Sheik Mohadin and some Hindus who said that in so doing no mamool would be violated. This party seems to have been in immediate charge of the Police Inspector who had then been newly posted to the place. The Amildar Magistrate's report shows however that no excess were committed and that the mosque before which the procession is said to have passed is not entitled to the privilege of stoppage of music (being a recently constructed one).

6. As regards the failure on the part of the Police to circu--late copies of my order dated 28th February 1907, allowing the procession to be held in accordance with the previous agreement of 1889 between the Hindus and Mussalmans and referred to in para 7 of the Amildar's recent report (vide supra), the Police Super--intendent has in this Office yadi No.1722 of 5th April 1907, been requested to duly note the carelessness of the Police In--spector against him.

7. In conclusion I have to add that when I was at Chennapatna on the 22nd February last, no complaint whatever was made to me that the attitude of the local Police (as alleged in para 3 (a)

of the enclosure to your memo under reply) was partial to the Hindus although I saw and conversed with many Mahomedans. Some of the leading Hindus met me and discussed the matter and I told them that the procession would be allowed according to mamool, as per orders passed. Both parties appeared to be satisfied with this and no complaints were made on either side at the time. I am of opinion that the Police acted with discretion in the matter and that there is no real cause for complaint. The main facts of the case are that the Mahomedans now wish to withdraw from the terms of their agreement made some years ago.

8. The enclosure to the memo under reply and the other papers above referred to including the files received with your docket No.J.3076/Pol.1 of 06 of the 4th instant are herein enclosed as per ferists.

9. The records of Criminal Miscellaneous Case No.43 of 1905-6 on the file of the Court of the Assistant Commissioner Magistrate Closepet Sub Division and the records of Criminal Miscellaneous No.22A of 1906-7 on the file of my Court in which case I have held " that the privilege which the Mahomedans wish to claim is a negative one of placing the other community under a permanent disability and which is not founded upon substantial grounds " are enclosed in a sealed cover.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

District Magistrate,

Bangalore District.

B.N.S

47

Police

G.R.S. 26]

File No. 1/9

Serial No 387

Diary No. of letter replied to 2710

No. J 3353

Enclosure Sheet

General and Rev. Secretariat

( )

, *the* 190 .

To

H. Lubeck Esqr. B.A. ~~L.L.B~~ L.B.

Bar-at-Law

Parry's Buildings

Madras

Date of issue 1-5-07

Signed by [illegible]

Sir,

In reply to your letter ~~dated~~ of the 7th March 1907 requesting to be heard on behalf of the Mahomedans of Chamapatna, regarding the Consent of the Kanna proceedings of the place, I am directed to state that Mr. K. P. Puttanna Chetty, Member of H.H. the Maharajas Council

over.

~~The case will be heard~~

SUBJECT.

4d

hear both the parties on Monday the 20th May 1907
will ~~be glad to meet~~

~~You~~ at the Public Offices
~~in the Cubbon Park,~~

Bangalore, ~~on the~~ May 1907
and to hear what you
have to say in the
matter.

2. The ~~xxxxx~~ postage stamp
received with your letter is
herewith returned

I have &c

for Secretary,

B.R.
30.4.07

List of enclosures,

Copied by

Examined by

MGCPB—20,000-19-12—04.

G.R.S. 26]

47

Police

File No. 1/296

Serial No 393

Diary No. of letter replied to 2710

No. J 3388
Police 06

General and Rev. Secretariat
( )
, *the* 190 .

To

S.N. Ramaswamiengar Esq
Advocate, Bangalore

Sir

Date of issue 4.5.07

I am directed to inform you that Mr. K.P. Puttanna Chetty, Member of H.H. the Maharaja's Council, will hear both the parties in the matter of the conduct of the Kanva procession of Channapatna on Monday the 20th May instant at the Public Offices, Bangalore

Signed by Mr K. Matthan

~~case~~ complaint
Hab ~~of~~ the Mahamadans
of Channapatna in the
matter of the conduct of the
Kanva procession of the Hindus of
the place has been posted
to the Monday the 20th inst
~~2nd~~ inst.

I have &c
for Secretary

BS
2.5.07

SUBJECT.

File no 1406
Sl no 394 50

మైసూరు శ్రీమన్మహారాజవారికి

J 3389 / Idlice 1-06 — 4.5.07 రద జనరల్ మద్రాసు విద్యా సీతాపతి

యొక్క విజ్ఞాపన —

చిన్నపత్ర దత్తు మనవి చేసినారి,
~~సంతోషముగా~~ సాహిత్యాంబ ... (interlinear)
~~సుఖం~~ —

చిన్నప్పుడు చూచినట్టుగా
నలుగురినీ కొరకు నిలుపుటకు గలుగు
మహామహిమలు ఇరువురినీ
సంబంధించిన పత్రమే యున్న
బెంగళూరు ఉపాధ్యాయ ఆఫీసు నుండి
దక్షిణ ౧౯౦౨ నే ఇక్కడ తీసుకొని
మైసూరు శ్రీమన్
మహారాజ వారి సన్నిధానమునకు
కౌన్సిలర్ సిం.కె.పి. ద్వారా చేర్చి
యున్నను వారి మొదటి రోజున
సంగతి తెలియపరిచెదనే ——

బహుళ జోహారులు

ఇట్లు

గి. సీతాపతి.

R/3.5.07 [signature] 8/5/07

G.R.S. 26]

51
Police
File No. 1906
Serial No 423

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

No. J 3573

General and Rev. Secretariat
( )
, *the* 190 .

To The Hon. Mayor
Bangalore

Sir

Date of issue 21. 5-07

Signed by [illegible]

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter no S. 793 D/the 20th April 1907 regarding the dispute between the Hindus and the Mahamadans of Chennapatna in connection with holding the Rama procession, I am directed to observe that while a license was issued on 17 March 1891 to the Hindus of the Ganda Mane (a suburb of Chennapatna) to take the procession round certain streets of Chennapatna, the licenses issued in 1895 and

over.

SUBJECT.

52

2760

subsequent years prohibit the processions ~~passing~~ of the Gandemarn village passing the Railway ~~gate~~ ~~to~~ gate. It is ~~asserted~~ asserted by the Mahomedans that the license of 1892 was issued contrary to ~~the~~ custom and that on their raising objection thereto, it was decided in subsequent years that the processions should not pass by the Railway gate. It is said that some correspondence took place, probably in the Police Dept, in connection with this objection. I am to request that this correspondence may be forwarded by post for reference very early. I am also to ask that copies of the licenses issued in 1892, 1892, 1893, & 1894 for the Hema procession of the Gandemarn village may also be forwarded.

I have
the
honor
to

List of enclosures,

Copied by

Examined by

(53)

J 3185
1906

From
The Dist. Magistrate
Bangalore Dist

To
The Secy. to Govt. of Mysore
Gen. Revenue Dept.

Dated 26.
Despatched June 1906.
Received
General No.
S No. 908.
Enclosure No. 1 / 1 folio

His No. J 3573 of 21.5.06
Rol. 1906

Reports that no correspondence took place in the Police Dept. re the objection of the Mahomedans to the Kama procession at Channapatna.

54.

Bangalore District

District Magistrate's Office.

S. No. 908.

Bangalore 26th June 1907.

From,

H. H. Sparkes Esqure,
District Magistrate,
Bangalore District.

To C.S. Balasundaram Iyer Esqure B.A.
Offg. Secretary to the Government
of Mysore
General & Revenue Departments,

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. J. 3513 Police 1906 dated 21st May 1906, calling for some correspondence that took place in the Police Department, regarding the objection of the Mahomedans in the issue of the licence during the Rama procession at Channapatna, I have the honor to

to forward herewith copy of Police Superintendents' letter No. 1410 dated 17th June 1907, from which it will be seen that no correspondence appears to have taken place in the Police Department for conducting the processin through the Railway Gate. No other records are reported to be forthcoming.

2. Copy of esbracts from the License Register of July 1893 and 1892-93 with copy of Inspectors General Diary dated 3rd March 1893 and 21st March 1894 and copy of esbract from the Criminal Register of 1891-92, received from the Superintendent of Police are herewith

56

Herewith submitted

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most Obedient Servant.

Asstt Secretary.

for District Magistrate

Mz

Letter No. 1410 dated 17th June 1907
from the Superintendent of Police
Bangalore District to the Deputy
Commissioner, Bangalore District

Reference - Your memo No. 1893
dated 25th May 1907, forwarding
letter No. J 3513/Pol: 1 of 06 dated
21st May 1907, from the Secretary,
General & Revenue Departments,
calling for records regarding
the Kama procession in Chamarajpet.

I have the honor to forward
herewith records as per phoresis,
and to state that no correspondence
appears to have taken place in
the Police Department as to whether
the procession should or should
not pass beyond the Railway gate.

58

No other records are forthcoming either in the District Police Office, or in the Taluk.

"Copy"

Illegible

for District Magistrate and Bangalore District

Fair Copy

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read:-

Petition dated the 10th January 1907, from Peer Sab and certain other Mehomedans of the Chennapatna Town, appealing against the order of the District Magistrate of Bangalore authorizing the issue of a license to the Hindues of Chennapatna to carry their Kama in procession through certain streets, contrary to mamool.

2). Letter No. 597 , dated the 1st February 1907, from the District Magistrate of Bangalore stating with reference to this office memo No. J. 2049/dated the 17th January 1907, that he had authorized the issue of the license to the Hindus of Chennapatna in accordance with the terms of an agreement entered into between the Hindus and the Mehomedans of the town in 1899, but that he had, however, issued instruction to hold the order in abeyance pending the disposal of the appeal made to Government.

3). Petition dated the 1st March 1907, from Peer Sab of Chennapatna stating that the District Magistrate has directed the issue of licenses to the Hindus to conduct the Kama procession on the 2nd idem and praying that the above

60

order may be held in abeyance until the disposal of their appeal.

4). Telegram dated the 2nd March 1907 purporting to be from the Mehomedans of Chennapatna stating that the Amildar and the Police Inspector of the place had barred the principal roads so as to obstruct their passage to the drinking water tank and to the bazaar and that these officers with a show of Police force backed the Hindus in carrying the Kama -- procession through Mehmmedan streets contrary to mamool.

5). Petition dated the 16th March 1907, from Peera Sab and other Mehomedans confirming their telegram of the 2nd idem and making certain allegations against the Police Inspector, the Amildar and the District Superintendent of ---- Police in regard to the conduct of the Kama procession on the above date.

6). Letter No. 793 dated the 24th April 1907, from the District Magistrate, Bangalore District, submitting a detailed report on the allegations contained in the above petition.

7). Letter No. 908 dated the 26th June 1907, from the same officer, forwarding certain records in the above case.

Order thereon:- No. I 869-Police 1-406 D/

Bangalore dated the, 9th September 1907.

The facts of the case are as follows:-

In March 1906 certain Hindus of Channapatna, residing in the Fort and the Pettah and in Ganderadu, which is a suburb of Channapatna, applied to the Assistant Commissioner and 1st class Magistrate of Clospet for a license to carry their Kama procession jointly through the town of -- Channapatna as they were empowered to do so under an ------ agreement entered into between the Hindus and the Mahomedans of the town in the year 1889. The Assistant Commissioner referred the petition to the Amildar for disposal under the Police Rules after taking any evidence that may be ----- adduced by the petitioners and their opponents. In the -- enquiry before the Amildar, one of the parties said that they could not expect to get justice from that Officer. Thereupon the Amildar sent the records to the Assistant Comr. and 1st class Magistrate. In the meantime a petition was received by the District Magistrate of Bangalore on the -- same subject which was also referred to the Assistant --- Commissioner and 1st class Magistrate of Clospet for dis-

posal

62

disposal. The 1st class Magistrate Mr. Ananda Rao Sirsi after hearing both sides, rejected the application on the ground that the terms of the agreement of 1889 had never been acted upon and that there was no evidence to show that the Kama processions of the three places had been --- taken jointly within the past 12 years, but that, on the contrary, the licenses issued to the people of Gandemadu between the years 1894 and 1901 distinctly prohibited the taking of their procession beyond the Railway crossing near Gandemadu. He however observed that there was no objection to the people of the Pete, the Fort and Gandemadu applying to the Amildar and obtaining licenses to conduct their processions separately in their respective limits according to Mamool. The Hindus thereupon appealed to the District Magistrate. The District Magistrate Mr. Sparkes in his order dated the 24th November 1906 set aside the 1st class Magistrate's order, on the ground that the fact that the agreement had not been acted upon for some time did not debar the Hindus from exercising their rights at the present time. It is against this order of the ------- District Magistrate that an appeal has been preferred to Government.

B oth

64

In the year 1891 a license for the Kama procession was given more or less on the lines of this decision of the Panchayat. In 1892 and 1893, however, the license granted to the Gandemadu people directed that they should go only up to Agasar Basava's house in Kumbargeri. From 1894 downwards the licenses expressly prohibited the Kama procession of Gandemadu passing beyond the Railway crossing which divides Gandemadu from Kumbargeri.

It is argued on behalf of the Mahomedans that the agreement entered into by a few of their number may ------ possibly bind them personally, but cannot be regarded as binding on the whole Community. It is true that in 1891 a license more or less in accordance with the terms of the agreement was issued; but in 1892 and 1893 apparently on the objection of the Mahomedan Community, the license prohibited the taking of the procession beyond a certain house in Kumbargeri, while in subsequent years, a further restriction was placed that the procession should not go beyond the Railway crossing.

On behalf of the Hindus it is argued that if in these years license was given to take the procession only up to the Railway crossing, it was because that was all

that

65

that was applied for, as the people of Gendemadu were not n good terms with the people of the town and besides they probably did not wish to come into the Town on account of plague and that the fact that they did not exercise their rights under the agreement for a certain period does not prevent them from exercising these rights now. As regards these points it has, in the first place, to be observed that there is absolutely no proof that in the applications for the licenses in 1894 and subsequent years permission was asked for to take the processions only up to the ---- Railway crossing. Seeing that a license on the lines of the agreement was issued in 1891 and that it was departed from in the subsequent years, the probability is that there must have been some opposition on the part of the Mahomedans against the procession being carried through their streets in Kumbargeri and that this opposition was recognised by the local authorities as valid in spite of the agreement.

As far then, as established mamool goes, the Gandemadu people have no right to take their Kara procession beyond the Railway crossing or to hold the procession --- jointly with the people of the fort and the petta. As ---

regards

66

regards the agreement executed in 1889 by the representatives of the Mahomedan and Hindu Communities, whatever its binding effect may have been in the first two years after it was entered into it has been in abeyance and there has even been departure from its terms during the last 15 years. As observed by Government in their Proceedings No. 5096-103½/Muzrai, dated 15th May 1906, questions of this nature should be decided more with reference to precedents and mamool than on abstract principles of the rights of the public. The Government find the mamool in this instance to be that the Kama procession of the Gandemadu superb should not be allowed to pass beyond the --- Railway crossing. As regards the processions of the Fort and Petta also the mamool which existed in previous to the procession of the current year should be followed..

There is nothing to prevent the members of the opposing communities to come to an understanding and say that the procession may pass beyond the Railway crossing but until such understanding is come to and so far as existing mamool is concerned the direction given in the above para should be followed. The order of the Deputy Commissioner will be set aside.

For

67

For the Kara festival of the current year, a license was issued in accordance with the decision of the District Magistrate; and the people of Gandemadu, the Fort and the Petta had a joint procession in the Town on the 2nd March 1907. In their petition to Government, the Mahomedans have complained that the Police authorities had barred their streets, and prevented them from going out on their business that music was not stopped near the Burial ground and in front of the Masjid and that the Police Officers committed various other acts of high-handedness. The reports of the District Magistrate, the Sub-Divisional Magistrate and the Superintendent of Police show that the alleged barring was adopted only with a view to prevent crush, that space was allowed for the people to pass in single file and that the obstructions were removed as soon as the procession was over. The other complaints are also reported to be ----- frivolous and highly exaggerated. The Government do not see any reason to take any further notice of these complaints.

(sd) C.S. Balasundaram Iyer

Offg: Secretary to Government.

Sd

To

The District Magistrate Bangalore, returning the records.

A.V.

68
file no. 1706-07
file no 470

Proceedings of the Govt. of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read:-

Petition dated the 10th January 1907, from Peer Sab and certain other Mehommedans of the Channapatna Town, appealing against the order of the Dt. Magistrate of Bangalore authorising the issue of a license to the Hindus of Chennapatna to carry their Kama in procession through certain streets, contrary to mamool.

2). Letter No.597, dated the 1st February 1907, from the District Magistrate of Bangalore stating, with reference to this office memo. No.J.2049/ dated the 17th January 1907, that he had authorised the issue of the license to the Hindus of Chennapatna in accordance with the terms of an agreement entered into between the Hindus and the Mohommedans of the town in 1889, but that he had, however, issued instruction to hold the order in abeyance pending the disposal of the appeal made to Government.

3). Petition dated the 1st March 1907, from Peer Sab of Chennapatna stating that the District Magistrate has directed the issue of licenses to the Hindus to conduct the Kama procession on the 2nd idem and praying that the above order may be held in abeyance un

until the disposal of their appeal.

4). Telegram dated the 2nd March 1907 purporting to be from the Mehommedans of Chennapatna stating that the Amildar and the Police Inspector of the place had barred the principal roads so as to obstruct the ir passage to the drinking water tank and to the bazaar and that these officers with a show of Police force backed the Hindus in carrying the Kama procession through Mehommedan streets contrary to mamool.

5). Petition dated the 16th March 1907, from Peera Sab and others Mehommedans confirming their telegram of the 2nd idem and making certain allegations against the Police Inspector, the Amildar and the District Superintendent of Police in regard to the conduct of the Kama procession on the above date.

6). Letter No.793 dated the 24th April 1907, from the District Magistrate, Bangalore District, submitting a detailed report on the allegations contained in the above petition.

7) Letter No.908 dated the 26th June 1907, from the same officer, forwarding certain records in the above case.

J 809/Police 106 (Confidential)
9.9.07

Order thereon:- No. d/

Signed by Mr. K. Mylar Rao

The facts of the case are as follows:-

In March 1906 certain Hindus of Chennapatna, residing in the Fort and the Pettah and in Gandamadu, which is a suburb of Chennapatna, applied to the Asstt. Commr. & 1st class Magistrate of Closepet for a license to carry their Kama procession jointly through the town of Chennapatna as they were empowered to do so under an agreement entered into between the Hindus and the Mahommedans of the town in the year 1889. The Asstt. Commr. referred the petition to the Amildar for disposal, under the Police Rules, after taking any evidence that may be adduced by the petitioners and their opponents. In the enquiry before the Amildar, one of the parties said that they ~~would not obtain~~ could not expect to get justice from that officer. Thereupon the Amildar sent the records to the Asstt.Comr. and 1st class Magistrate. In the mean time a petition was received by the Dt. Magistrate of Bangalore on the same subject, which was also referred to the

Asstt. Commr. and 1st class Magistrate of Closepet for disposal. The 1st class Magistrate, Mr Annundra Rao Sirsi after hearing both sides, rejected the application on the grounds that the terms of the agreement of 1889 had never been acted upon and that there was no evidence to show that the Kama processions of the three places had been taken jointly within the past 12 years, but that, on the contrary, the licenses issued to the people of Gandhe madu between the years 1894 and 1901 distinctly prohibited the taking of their procession beyond the railway crossing near Gandhmadu. He however observed that there was no objection to the people of the Pete, the Fort and Gendamadu applying to the Amildar and obtaining licenses to conduct their processions separately in their respective limits according to Mamool.

The Hindus thereupon appealed to the District Magistrate. The District

Magistrate, Mr.Sparkes, in his ~~note~~ order dated the 24th November 1906 set aside the 1st class Magistrate's order on the ground that the fact that the agreement had not been acted upon for some time did not debar the Hindus from exercising their rights at the present time. It is against this order of the District Magistrate that an appeal has been preferred to Government.

Both the parties were heard on the 20th May 1907. Mr.Lubeck, Bar-at-Law, appeared on behalf of the Mohammadans and Mr.S.N.Ramaswami Iyengar, Advocate, for the Hindus. After careful consideration of the arguments advanced by both parties and of the further information obtained from the District Magistrate, the Government are of opinion that the order of the District Magistrate cannot be ~~upheld~~ supported.

In the year 1889 there was a dispute between the Hindus and Mohamadans

of Chennapatna which led to a riot. Subsequently, in the same year, with a view to prevent such disturbances in the future, certain Hindus and Mohammadans of the place, referred the question of regulating their religious processions to a panchayet consisting of 4 Hindus and 4 Mohammadans. The panchayet laid down the procedure to be adopted in connection with the conduct of the various Hindu and Mohammadan festivals. In regard to the Kama festival ~~the decision of~~ the panchayet permitted the procession being carried from the Railway gate through Kumbargeri and by way of the high road below the tank, to the Pete and back. The procession was also permitted to go to Yelekere (another name for Gandemadu) and back through Kumbarageri.

In the year 1891 a license for the Kama procession was given more or less on the lines of this decision of the panchayet. In 1892-~~93~~ 1893 however, the

74

the license granted to the Gandemadu people directed that they should go only upto Agasar Basava's house in Kumbar Ageri. From 1894 downwards the licenses expressly prohibited the procession of the Gendamadu people passing beyond the railway crossing which divides Gendamadu from Kumbarageri.

It is argued on behalf of the Mehommedans that the agreement entered into by a few of their number may possibly bind them personally, but cannot be regarded as binding on the whole community. It is true that in 1891 a license more or less in accordance with the terms of the agreement was issued; but in 1892 1893, apparently on the objection of the Mahommedan community, the license prohibited the taking of the procession beyond a certain house in Kumbarageri, while in subsequent years, a further restriction was placed, that the procession should not go beyond the Railway crossing.

On behalf of the Hindus it is argued that if in these years license was given to take the procession only up to the Railway crossing, it was because that was all that was applied for as the people of Gandimadu were not on good terms with the people of the town, and besides they probably did not understand become unbearable on account of plague and that the fact that they did not exercise their rights under the agreement for a certain period does not prevent them from exercising these rights now. As regards these points it has, in the first place to be observed that there is absolutely no proof that in the applications for licenses in 1894 and subsequent years permission was asked for to take the processions only up to the Railway crossing. Seeing that a license on the lines of the agreement was issued in 1891 and that it was departed from in the subsequent years, the ~~most~~ probably ~~inference~~

inference is that there must have been some opposition on the part of the Mohammedans against the procession being carried through their streets in Kumbarageri, and that this opposition was recognised by the local authorities as valid in spite of the ~~argument.~~ agreement

As far, then, as established mamool goes, the Gandemadu people have no right to take their Kama procession beyond the Railway crossing or to hold the procession jointly with the people of the Fort and the Petta. As regards, ~~It is doubtful whether~~ the agreement executed in 1889 by the representatives of the ~~a few~~ Mohammadans and Hindu communities ~~and a few Hindus can be regarded~~ as binding upon the whole community. Even if it was, the local authorities have not recognized it as valid. The Government do not consider it desirable to now enforce the terms of an agreement of doubtful validity, which has remained inoperative for nearly 16 years. As observed by Govt: in their Proceedings No. 5096-103½/Muzrai dated 5th May 1906, ~~such~~ questions of this nature should be decided with more reference to precedents than on abstract principles of law and mamool. The Government ~~therefore~~ find the mamool in the instant case to be that ~~direct that~~ the Kama procession of the Gandemadu suburb should not, ~~in future~~ be allowed to pass beyond the Railway crossing. ~~The decision of the District Magistrate~~

Whatever its binding effect may have been in the first two years after it was entered into it has been in abeyance and has even been departure from its terms during the last 15 years

of this para:-

As regards the processions of the Fort & Petta also the mamool previous to which existed the current year procession should be strictly followed.

~~Magistrate is hereby set aside~~

For the Kama festival of the current year, a license was issued in accordance with the decision of the District Magistrate; and the people of Gandemadu, the Fort and the Petta had a joint procession in the town on thv 2nd March 1907. I n their petition to Government, the Mohammadans have complained that the Police authorities barricaded their streets, and prevented them from going about on their business, that music was not stopped near the burial ground and in front of the Masjid and that the police officers committed various other acts of high-handedness. The reports of the District Magistrate, the Sub-Divisional Magistrate and the Superintendent of Police show that the alleged barricading was only with a view to prevent crush, that space was allowed for the people to pass in a single file and that the obstructions were removed as soon as the procession was over. T h e other complaints are also reported to be

There is nothing to prevent the members of the opposing Communities to Come to an understanding & say that the procession may have beyond the Railway Crossing but until such understanding is Come to & so far as the Standing Mamul is Concerned the direction given in the above para ~~of~~ ~~Govt~~ should be followed. The Border of the ~~Dist~~ Compound will be set aside

frivolous and highly exaggerated. The Government do not see any reason to take any further notice of these complaints.

2d Council

21/8/07

To
The Dr. Magte, Bangalore
returning the
records

File no. 1706
Sl no. 4911

8

No. 9899
police 1-06

MYSORE GOVT. GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT,
Dated, Bangalore, 19th Sept 1907

ENDORSEMENT GRANTED TO Mr. S. N. Ramaswamiengar, Advocate, Bangalore, counsel for the Hindus of Channapatna, in the Kaveri procession case. --

~~in reply to ——— Petition Registered No. ——— dated~~

~~Petitioner~~ He is informed that Govt. have set aside the order of the Dy. Comr. appealed against and directed that the procession of the Gandhinagar Suburb be not allowed to pass beyond the Ry. crossing and that as regards the procession of the Fort and Petta the manner which existed previous to the procession of the current year be followed.

Govt. observe that there is nothing to prevent the members of the opposing communities to come to understanding and say that the procession may pass the Ry. crossing but until such understanding is come and so far as existing manner is concerned the directions contained in the above para should be followed.

By Order,

for *Secretary.*

16/9/07

File no. 1/06 8
Sl no. 472

No. J 900

MYSORE GOVT. GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT,
Dated, Bangalore, 19th Sept 1907

ENDORSEMENT GRANTED TO Peer Sab and other Mahomedans of Channapatna

in reply to their Petition Registered No. J 1696 dated the 17th Dec. 1906 and subsequent petitions, complaining against the order of the Dy. Comr. of Bangalore allowing the Hindus of Gandemaan to take their Rama procession beyond the Ry. gate and then to join with the processions of the pettah & the fort

Petitioners ~~is~~ are informed ~~that~~, through their counsel, Mr. H. Lubeck, B.A., LL.B., Bar-at-Law that the Govt. of H.H. the Maharaja have set aside the order appealed against and directed that the ~~procession~~ procession of the Gandemaan Subrub be not allowed to pass beyond the Ry. crossing and that as regards the processions of the fort & Pettah the manual which existed prior to the procession of the current year be followed.

2. Govt. observe that there is nothing to prevent members of the opposing communities coming to an understanding and say that the procession may pass beyond the Ry. crossing but until such understanding is arrived at and so far as the existing manual is concerned the direction given in the above para should be followed

3. The enclosures to their petitions are herewith returned

By Order,

For Secretary.

302 from A. Lubeck Esq/B.A. LLB dt 7.3.1907

Requests that he may be heard on behalf of the Mahomedans before final orders are moved

303 from Secr Sabha Sthana 4.3.1907.

Complains that they were fenced in while the procession passed through their streets against usage

314 Same as above.

32. From the Pte Secy. to H.H. the Maharaja. Forwards a Telegram purporting to be the same as above.

321 To the Distt magte. Bangalore. No J302 dt 26.3.1907

Forwards SR No 314 for report.

10 To the Dewan officer. No J 3076 dt 4.4.1907

Calls for a detailed report in the matter.

79 from the same officer through the Dy. Superintendent No 3738

Submits the report called for.

37 To A. Lubeck Esqr. B.A. LLB. Barrister-at-Law. Madras

No J3353 dt 4.5.07.

393 To S.N. Ramaswamiengar Esqr Advocate Bangalore

No. J3388 dt 1.5.07

States that the 2nd Commissioner will hear both the parties on the 20th instt of May 1907. at the Public Office.

394 To Rao Saheb Venkataramiah Sthana Amildar

No J3389 dt 4.5.07

Same as above.

423 To the Distt magte Bangalore No J3573 dt 21.5.07

Calls for Certified Records

448 from the Dewan officer. No 908 dt 26.6.07

Table of contents Contd:

States that no correspondence appears to have taken place in the Police Deptt. for Conducting Prisoners through the Railway. Sate a proforma to extracts from certain license registers &c.

470 | To the Distt Magte. Bangalore. No 8099 39-20
Sets aside his order. in the case

471 | To S.W. Ranganathaiengar Esqr No 8997
472 | Lushington Esq Bar.at.Law. No 9000 8914
Informs them of the above.